

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7-11, 13, 16-24 and 62-64 are now pending in this application. Claims 4, 12 and 25-61 were canceled previously; claims 5, 6, 14, 15 and 65 have been canceled herein. Claims 1, 8, 16 and 62 are independent claims.

Claims 1 and 59 were objected to because of various informalities. Applicants believe the Examiner is referring to claims 1, 16 and 62. Claim 59 has previously been canceled. Claims 1, 16 and 62 have been amended herein to overcome the informalities.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 5, 6, 8, 16, 18, 23 and 62-64 contain allowable subject matter.

In order to place the application in condition for allowance at this time, the allowable limitations of claim 6 have been added to independent Claim 1. Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled and the various claims that depended therefrom have been amended to now depend from claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, as failing to provide antecedent basis for “the first and second plurality of transponders.” This rejection has been addressed by changing the dependency of claim 9 to claim 7.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as failing to provide antecedent basis for “the blocking filter element.” This rejection has been addressed by changing the dependency of claim 19 to claim 18.

Claim 65 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. This rejection is moot since claim 65 has been canceled above.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 17 and 24 are rejected under 102(e) as being anticipated by Sharratt et al. (US 7,136,586, “Sharratt”). Claim 65 is rejected under 102(e) as being anticipated by Aihara et al. (US 6,856,594 B1, “Aihara”).

Claims 3 and 20 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharratt in view of Galou et al. (US Pat Pub. 2004/0085354 A1, “Galou”). Claims 7 and 9 are

rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharratt in view of Ibikuro et al. (US Pat 6,697,546, “Ibikuro”). Claim 10 is rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharratt in view of Ibikuro, and further in view of Elliot et al. (U.S. Pat 6,587,470, “Elliot”). Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharratt in view of Ibikuro and Elliot, and further in view of Li et al. (U.S. Pat 6,414,765, “Li”). Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharratt and Galou, and further in view of May, Jr., et al. (U.S. Pat 6,321,255, “May”).

Each of these rejections are moot in light of the amendments above.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner believes there are still unresolved issues, a telephone call to the undersigned would be welcomed.

FEES

Any fees that may be due and owing as a result of this Amendment may be charged to the undersigned attorney’s PTO Deposit Account No. 50-1047.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Attorney for Applicants
Mayer & Williams PC
251 North Avenue West, 2nd Floor
Westfield, NJ 07090
908-518-7700 Tel.
908-518-7795 Fax

Respectfully submitted,

By /Stuart H. Mayer/

Stuart H. Mayer
Registration No.: 35,277